



CARDINAL MANNING.

IS DR. MANNING,

WHO CLAIMS TO BE A CARDINAL AND ARCHBISHOP OF
WESTMINSTER,

A LOYAL ENGLISHMAN?

BY

CHARLES HASTINGS COLLETTE,

"Vera redit facies, dissimulata perit."

VIRGIL.

LONDON:

1887.

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR.

'Latet anguis in herba.'

VIRGIL.

The following appeared in successive numbers of *The English Churchman*; and duly forwarded by me to Dr. MANNING. He may probably, have considered it beneath his dignity to take notice of the charges brought against him, but I submit to the judgment of the reader, whether I have not conclusively proved out of Dr. MANNING's own writings, and of those to which he has given his sanction and recommendation, that he is not, and cannot be,

"A LOYAL ENGLISHMAN."

C. H. COLLETTE.

2, Lanhill Road,
St. Peter's Park,
London, W.

To the Right Honorable

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL.

MY LORD,—The recent correspondence between your Lordship and the Honorary Secretary of the Scottish Protestant Alliance, induces me to call your attention to the Pamphlet to which this letter is appended.

Your Lordship scouts the idea that:—"the Papacy claims universal "Supremacy over all Sovereigns and their Subjects, that Roman Catholics "can no longer render an undivided allegiance to Protestant Princes, and "that the avowed aim of the Papacy is to reduce Britain to subjection to "the Vatican"—"Anent the appointment of Mr. MATTHEWS, Q.C., as "Home Secretary." And you "observe with astonishment and regret that, "in this age of enlightenment and general toleration, persons professing to "be educated and intelligent can arrive at conclusions so senseless and "irrational as those which are set forth in the aforesaid resolution."

You further consider that to entertain such ideas of our Roman Catholic fellow countrymen would suggest the necessity of the re-enactment of the "Penal Laws," long since erased from our Statute Books.

I need scarcely remind your Lordship that these so-called Penal Laws were enacted to protect the person of Queen Elizabeth from the dagger of Papal fanatics, and the State from the acts of rebels and traitors, incited by the atrocious Papal Bill of:—"The Damnation and excommunication of Queen Elizabeth and her adherents" as heretics, issued by Paul III., which was renewed by Pope Gregory, his successor.

These convicted traitors were hanged under those Penal Laws. Although it is not at all likely in this advanced period of the nineteenth century

that the present Pope will imitate the example of his predecessors, by the issue of a similar Bull, or that flights of Seminary Priests will again, at his bidding, invade our shores to foment rebellions and treasons, and circumvent the life of our gracious Queen, yet we have the startling fact, that the head of the Roman Hierarchy in England, Dr. MANNING, has given his public sanction to the statement that these rebels and traitors, including the arch traitor, CAMPION, and the accomplice of Guy Faux—GARNETT—who suffered death under these same Penal Laws, as traitors to their Sovereign and Country—are to be enrolled as martyred Saints in heaven, that they shed their blood “for Christ’s Sake,” and for the “Catholic Faith.” And Dr. MANNING endorses the appeal, that should occasion require it, their example must be followed by every “Catholic.” As not one of these so-called martyrs suffered for holding or teaching one single Article contained in the Roman Creed, we are left to no other alternative, than to conclude, that according to Dr. MANNING the “Catholic Faith” for which these traitors suffered, and whose examples is to be imitated, was “to uphold the claims of the Papacy to universal Supremacy over all Sovereigns and their Subjects, and that Roman Catholics can no longer render an undivided allegiance to Protestant Princes, and that the avowed aim of the Papacy is to reduce Britain to subjection to the Vatican.” Indeed, as will be seen, these are the avowed sentiments publicly proclaimed by Dr. MANNING. He adds that they must be “Catholics first, and Englishmen afterwards”! “Catholics first and citizens afterwards”! In his estimation a “Catholic” is the servant of the Pope to do his will. Dr. MANNING has himself struck the key note, and all Romanists are bound to play in harmony. From this “Band” why should the Right Hon. Mr. MATTHEWS be excluded, against whose nomination as Home Secretary the Scottish Protestant Alliance have protested? Have they no grounds on which they can justify their “Resolution”?

Mr. MATTHEWS was educated by the Jesuits.

The following appeared in the “English Churchman,” and has remained unquestioned :—

When seeking the suffrages of the electors of Dungarvan in 1868, Mr. MATTHEWS presented himself as a so-called *Liberal* “invited thither,” as he stated, “by the *Liberal* and patriotic electors of that Borough”—Republicans and Repealers. He indignantly repudiated the suggestion that he was a Tory, or “a nominee of the Tories.” He professed himself to be a firm supporter of Home Rule, and in favour of a separate Parliament

for Ireland. His words, as reported in the *Waterford Mail*, Nov. 9, 1868, were: "I have come here to represent the principle of Parliamentary independence. In the history of Ireland I know of nothing more melancholy than the failure of the efforts of your Parliamentary representatives; and that is why so many of you think there is no good to be got out of the British Parliament; that it is no use to agitate for measures in the Parliament that now sits in London, and that you can never hope for the redress of those evils under which you suffer until you have a native Parliament of your own, and of that I do not despair yet." Mr. MATTHEWS' personal experiences in the "British Parliament," of which he was a member from 1868 to 1874, seem to have confirmed his opinion of its incapacity to legislate for Ireland. In his address to the Electors of Dungarvan, when again seeking their suffrages in 1874, he wrote: "The question of Home Rule is one on which your opinions were hardly elicited in 1868. The country has now demanded that an Irish Parliament shall legislate for Ireland under conditions which were laid down at the recent conference at Dublin, and which many leaders of public opinion concurred in adopting. I consider that a demand so made is one which your representatives ought to support, and I have become a member of the Home Rule League formed to carry out the views of the conference." This address is signed "HENRY MATTHEWS, January 1874."

But Mr. MATTHEWS was something more than a Home Ruler. He was returned by the Voters of Dungarvan as the vindicator of the then recently convicted Fenians, said to have been unjustly aspersed on their trial by the Government Prosecutor, Mr. Serjeant BARRY. Mr. MATTHEWS' sympathy with convicted traitors was further shown in his speeches in Parliament. On the 10th February, 1870, we find him arguing in support of a motion for allowing the Fenian, O'DONOVAN ROSSA, then in prison, to take his seat in the House of Commons. ("HANSARD," cxcix., p. 133, Reports, February 10, 1870):—"Mr. HENRY MATTHEWS would have submitted with great confidence that Mr. O'DONOVAN ROSSA, the member-elect for Tipperary, was not subject to any disqualification known to the law. . . . The only legal disqualification for election was *attainder* for treason or felony. . . . *Attainder*, and *attainder* alone, carried disqualification with it. . . . With regard to the election of Mr. O'DONOVAN ROSSA, he looked upon it as being no more than an expression of the passionate sympathy felt in Ireland for the Fenians and the political prisoners." Such are the antecedents of the Hon. Member whom Lord SALISBURY has considered as eminently fitted for supervising the Administration of Justice in the Home Department.

Further than this, in his electioneering speeches, he denounced "the Protestant Establishment" and urged the Endowment by the State, of Colleges and Schools under the control of Jesuits, "the Christian Brothers and of the Sisters of Mercy." Until Mr. MATTHEWS, as a Roman Catholic, publicly repudiates the revolutionary sentiments, which I have recorded from the pen of Dr. MANNING, his Ecclesiastical Superior, and his own antecedents, your Lordship is not justified in expressing your "astonishment or regret that in this age of enlightenment and general "toleration, persons professing to be educated and intelligent, could arrive "at conclusions so senseless and irrational" as those which are set forth in the "Resolution" of the Scottish Protestant Alliance.

What guarantee, my Lord, have we that Mr. MATTHEWS is not now acting under the influence of the Jesuits, and that the Rev. Dr. MANNING is not his Father Confessor?

I remain,

Your Lordship's most obedient Servant,

C. H. COLLETTE.

2, Lanhill Road,
St. Peter's Park,
W.

IS DR. MANNING A LOYAL ENGLISHMAN?

—*Ast alii sex*
Et plures uno conclamant ore—
Juvenal. Sat.
(One mind inspires the whole fraternity.)

THE question whether Dr. Manning is a loyal Englishman suggests a doubt, and conveys an imputation of a very grave character, and should not be proposed without, at least, a semblance of justification. The consideration forces itself upon us in consequence of a declaration made by Dr. Manning himself, when on a late occasion he was requested to respond to a toast—"The two Houses of Parliament"—at a convivial meeting held at the Holborn Restaurant. In the *Daily Telegraph*, of the 13th May last (1886), Dr. Manning is reported to have said:—"As a member of their great Commonwealth he claimed to be wholly and altogether a loyal subject of our gracious Sovereign, and one most obedient to the laws of the land." And on a former occasion, vindicating his loyalty on a charge levelled against him by Mr. W. E. Gladstone, M.P., he stated:—"My desire and my duty as an Englishman, as a Catholic, and as a pastor, is to claim for my flock and for myself, a *civil allegiance* as pure, as true, and as loyal as is rendered by the distinguished author [Mr. Gladstone] of the pamphlet, or by any subject of the British Empire." (1)

There is an old saying that words were given us to hide our thoughts. If that be so, we may ask whether, in this instance, there has not also been an exercise of mental reservation.

"In the person of his Eminence is recognized, not only a Prince of the Church but the illustrious head of the Hierarchy of England; the people of Ireland also recognize a champion of whom [Roman] Catholic Europe is proud."

Such was the testimony of the Romish newspaper, *The Weekly Register*, of the 28th August, 1858, of the late Dr. Wiseman. The mantle, or, to speak ecclesiastically, the *Pallium*, (2) which graced the

(1) *The Vatican Decree*, p. 4. London, 1875.

(2) The manner of making the *Pallium* is as follows:—It is the custom for the nuns of St. Agnes to present two lambs every year as an offertory, on the altar of their Church, on the feast-day of their patroness Saint. These (holy) lambs are taken away during the night by the Pope's agents, and *ceremoniously* put to pasture till the coming time, when they are *ceremoniously* shorn; and the pall is made of their wool, mixed with other wool. It is then laid in the body of St. Peter, *i.e.*, on the high altar of the Lateran Church, said to contain the bodies of Saints Peter and Paul, and hence, because it is taken (*sumptum*) from the body of St. Peter, it confers (*ipso facto*) by its very touch, the plenitude of Pontifical power on whomsoever the Pope confers it for that purpose. This lucky discovery has been a source of incalculable wealth to the coffers of the Papacy. Pope Innocent III. decreed that it conveyed the plenitude of Apostolic power; and neither the functions, nor the title of Archbishop could be assumed without it, and that, too, even after translation from one province to another.

shoulders of "the illustrious head of the Hierarchy of England," is now borne by his successor, Dr. Manning.

What virtue, or what talents may have descended to the occupant of the illegal Diocese of Westminster is a matter of opinion, but it is certain that we have in the present possessor, Dr. Manning, the most determined, vigorous, and astute champion of the Papacy, and assailant of the English constitution in Church and State, "as by law established," and that he is *Papist* first and *Englishman* after.

In order to give a satisfactory answer to the question proposed for consideration, it will be necessary to commence *ab ovo*, and proceed step by step.

Dr. Manning held the high dignity in the Church of England of Archdeacon. For a series of years he was an eloquent preacher of the Gospel in its Evangelical purity and simplicity. His sermons were models of orthodox piety, free from all taint of "High Churchism." It was Dr. Newman in his "*Apologia*," (3) who said:—"Persistence in a given belief is no sufficient test of truth; but departure from it is at least a slur upon the man who has felt so certain about it." His secession from the Church has been by many attributed to disappointment in not being nominated Bishop to a then vacant See.

On leaving the Church of England to join the Church of Rome Dr. Manning was re-ordained a Priest of that Church, thus publicly ignoring the validity of his previous ordination. He thereupon subscribed the Creed of Pope Pius IV., which contains the following solemn declaration:—

"This true Catholic faith, *out of which no one can be saved*, which I now freely profess, and truly hold. I, Henry Edward Manning, *promise, vow, and swear* most constantly to hold and profess the same, whole and entire, with God's assistance, to the end of my life; and to procure, as far as lies in my power, that the same shall be held, taught, and preached by all who are under me, or are entrusted to my care by virtue of my office. So help me God, and these Holy Gospels of God." (4)

To carry into effect this oath, is to undermine the Protestant constitution of this country, which the Queen of England is sworn to maintain inviolate.

An article in that creed is as follows:—

"I acknowledge the Holy Catholic and Apostolic and Roman Church *the Mother and Mistress of all Churches*, and I promise and swear *true obedience* to the Roman Bishop, the successor of St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, and the Vicar of Jesus Christ."

By acknowledging the Roman Church as the *Mistress* of all churches

(3) p. 120, London, 1864.

(4) Concil. Trid., apud Bullas, p. 311. Romæ. 1564.

the Doctor must hold that the Church of England is her *servant*, or subject to her. By swearing true obedience to the Pope he becomes a *Papist*.

We shall have presently to consider what is included in this declaration of "true obedience" to the Pope to which Dr. Manning is pledged.

With reference to the Vatican Decree of 1870 on Infallibility, Dr. Manning issued a circular declaring that, although the Vatican Council was neither prorogued nor suspended, it had completed a distinct period of its work, and that the definitions of the Council require no other publication than the solemn act published to the Universal Church. (5) The decree on Infallibility of the Pope became at once a binding *Article of Faith*, and consequently an article of Pope Pius's Creed was amended as follows:—

"I likewise undoubtedly receive and profess all other things which the sacred Canons and General Councils, and particularly the Holy Council of Trent and the *Ecumenical Vatican Council*, have delivered, defined, and declared, *and in particular about the supremacy and infallible teaching of the Roman Pontiff.*" (6)

The Supremacy and Infallibility of the Pope became for the *first time* Articles of Faith, to which the Doctor subscribes, claiming for the Pope a supremacy not only over our Archbishops and Bishops, but also over our Queen as the Supreme Governor of our Church.

The Vatican decree on Infallibility, when the Pope speaks *ex-Cathedrâ* on questions of either *faith* or *morals*, has a retrospective action. Every such *ex-Cathedrâ* utterance becomes an Article of faith. As an illustration, Pope Boniface VIII., in his Bull, *Unam Sanctam*, which was confirmed by the reputed General Council of Lateran under Leo X., asserted:—"We declare, we say, *we define*, that it is necessary to salvation for every human creature that he should be subject to the Roman Pontiff." (7)

While Bishop Fessler, who acted as Secretary-General to the Vatican Council, in his recent work, *The True and the False Infallibility of the Popes* (8) limits the *ex-Cathedrâ* utterance of this Bull to this particular declaration Dr. Manning declares in his *Vatican Decrees*, p. 14:—"Certainly it is true," namely, that:—

"This definition, by retrospective action, makes all Pontifical acts infallible, the Bull *Unam Sanctam* included, and by prospective action will make all similar acts in future binding upon the conscience. For the present I affirm that all acts *ex-Cathedrâ*, such as the Bull *Unam Sanctam*, the Bull *Unigenitus*, the

(5) *Times*, Aug. 6, 1870.

(6) See *Catholic Belief*, 5th Edition, 1885, p. 344, sanctioned by Dr. Manning.

(7) *Corpus Juris Canonici*, tom. ii., p. 394, Paris, 1687.

(8) London, 1875, p. 66.

Bull *Auctorem Fidei*, and the like, are held to be infallible as fully before the Vatican Council as now. This Bull (*Unam Sanctam*) was, beyond all doubt, an act *ex-Cathedrâ*. It was confirmed by Leo X. in the Fifth Lateran Council; whatever definition, therefore, is to be found in this Bull, is to be received as of faith; it was, from the date of its publication, an infallible act, obliging all Catholics to receive it with interior assent." (*And see p. 56.*)

The terms and injunctions contained in these several Bulls will be more fully examined, to which Dr. Manning is sworn to give "true obedience;" for the present it is sufficient to note that it now becomes a part of his Creed or Article of Faith that not only is *he* a subject of the Pope of Rome, but in order to secure our salvation *we*, also, must submit to be subjects of the Pope.

Thus bound hand and foot to the Romish Juggernaut, Dr. Manning virtually ceases to be an English subject. *Papist first, Englishman after.*

During the Autumn Elections of 1885, Dr. Manning issued a Manifesto, "On the relation of the [R.] Catholic Church in this country to the commonwealth, and to the people of England," published in the *Tablet*, 24th October, 1885. He there speaks of "the people of Ireland being robbed of their own soil," and "the Catholic Church in England maintains as its highest endowments, its divine independence vindicated by endurance of spoliation, and of three centuries of penal laws." He bids his readers to be "Catholic first and Englishmen afterwards." Again, "We are Citizens first and Englishmen afterwards;" and he clearly teaches that when the two clash [R.] Catholics must prefer the interests of the Church to those of the nation, and must subordinate political action to the upholding and restoration of [R.] Catholic institutions.

The charge advanced by Dr. Manning that the people of Ireland "had been robbed of their own soil," is utterly untrue. Pope Adrian, under pretence of a forged Donation from the Emperor Constantine to the See of Rome, handed over the whole of Ireland to our Henry II. to conquer and subjugate. But he deprived no one of his tenure. England, therefore, first held Ireland under a title derived from the Pope. Under an Irish Parliament, all exclusively Romanists, and when Ireland was in revolt, and independent of England, they followed the example of Henry VIII., and confiscated the monastic and other properties, and divided the spoils among themselves. And Pope Paul V., during the reign of Mary, by a special Bull, confirmed all the titles of the lay holders of these confiscated properties, with a dispensation to hold the same, and with a plenary absolution for the supposed mortal sin. (9) Every Irish

(9) See Strype's *Eccl. Mem.*, vol. iii., p. 159. The Bull of Dispensation is given in the collection of Documents, vol. iii., p. 60, and in the *Harleian MSS.*, vol. ii., p. 267, 280, London, 1811, and Wilkin's *Concilia*, iv. 102.

Archbishop and Bishop took the oath of allegiance to Henry VIII., and voluntarily renounced the authority of the Pope, and retained the revenues of their Sees. And so also under Elizabeth, with the whole of the priesthood save two Bishops. Every present possessor of Irish soil, whether Englishman or Scotchman, holds his title by legal purchase *for money consideration*. It is, therefore, I repeat, utterly untrue, as alleged by Dr. Manning, that the people of Ireland "have been robbed of their soil."

Dr. Manning assumed the illegal territorial title of Archbishop of Westminster in June, 1865, at the hands and nomination of a foreigner. In assuming this title he was clearly acting in defiance of the law of this country, as the Queen alone is the fountain of all honours, as well ecclesiastical as civil. The parcelling out the country into dioceses by a foreign priest has been prohibited by repeated Acts of Parliament still remaining unrepealed. This act is also in direct contradiction of the decrees passed at the first four General Councils, which are as binding on Dr. Manning as the decrees of the Trent or Vatican Councils. The Church of England, as a branch of the one Universal Church, is as separate and independent of the Bishop of Rome as were the Churches of Constantinople, Antioch, Ephesus, and Alexandria, or other Eastern Churches of old; in whose dioceses no other than their own Metropolitans could appoint Bishops. And those laws also still remain unrepealed.

The utter contempt shown by English Papists of the laws of their country is aptly illustrated by the Romish Paper, *The Weekly Register* of 21st June, 1868; nor am I aware that Dr. Manning, as Ecclesiastical Superior, and within whose assumed jurisdiction that paper was published, has in any way interfered or objected to the following defiant declaration:—

"It [the Ecclesiastical Titles Act then in force] is broken every day in the year. It has been broken without hesitation or intermission ever since it received the Royal assent, and it will be broken without hesitation every time that its infraction becomes necessary, so long as it defiles the Statute-book. In this infraction of an unjust law, founded upon false impressions, there is no ostentation, but there is no hesitation. *There is not a Catholic Bishop in the United Kingdom* who ever pauses for a moment to discharge his episcopal functions, through apprehension of any consequences that can possibly result to himself, from disregarding the penal provisions either of the Catholic Relief Act or the Ecclesiastical Titles Act. These laws, so abhorrent to justice and to the principles of civil and religious liberty, upon which Englishmen plume themselves, *are constantly and openly broken* in the performance of duties with which they improperly interfere; and it is for the common sense and the enlightened public opinion of this country to determine how far it is conducive to the public honour and the common weal to maintain laws which are necessarily violated every day

by those against whom they are levelled, and which no Government ventures to enforce."

We are not, however, reminded that the Roman Church herself, where she has the power to enforce her tyranny, is the most intolerant and persecuting Church in existence. Civil and religious liberty are words expugned from her code. The Papacy claims to exercise, and, when possible, does exercise, supremacy over the law. The *Weekly Register* makes no secret of the intentions of those it represents, but says plainly:—"If we like the laws, we obey them; if not, we defy them."

Has Dr. Manning ever uttered a single protest against such revolutionary sentiments?

But The *Weekly Register* goes even further than this. In the issue of August 10, 1867, when Dr. Manning ruled as an Archbishop, we are told:—

"Does not every educated Protestant know that we always have, and always shall, utterly ignore the Bishops and Clergy of the Establishment as ministers of religion, and that in our eyes they are but so many highly respectable, well-paid laymen, entitled to our respect for their position in society; also, as a general rule, for their personal characters, and because they are recognised *civil servants of the Crown*? But, as Bishops or Priests, we place them upon exactly the same footing as Mr. Spurgeon, of the Baptists, or Dr. Cumming, of the Presbyterian Church—that is, we deny *in toto* their orders, their mission, and all that constitutes a clergy of a regular Church.

I ask Dr. Manning whether he has uttered a single protest against this deliberate insult offered to the entire Anglican Church and our Queen, who, in virtue of her office, solemnly nominates its Bishops?

Again, "Cardinal" is a title of a Prince of a foreign country conferred by a foreign potentate. As an English subject, the assumption of such a title, and its distinctive insignia of office, without Royal sanction, is also clearly illegal. By a Royal decree published in the *London Gazette* of December 6, 1823, we read:—

"No British subject shall accept a foreign order, or wear its insignia, without having previously obtained a warrant under the Royal Sign Manual (directed to the Earl Marshal of England) granting them His Majesty's permission to accept and bear the same."

This enactment remains unrepealed. Dr. Manning, notwithstanding, does not hesitate to disobey this order, and on stated occasions to display the insignia of his office as Cardinal.

In his character of Archbishop, Dr. Manning, presiding over The Third Provincial [Romish] Council of Westminster, addressed that illegal tribunal as follows:—

"This nineteenth century will make a great epoch in the history of the Church. . . . It is good for us to be here in England [and this from the mouth of an English subject!] It is yours, Right Rev. Fathers to *subjugate and*

subdue, to bend and to break the will of an Imperial race, the will which, as the will of Rome of old, rules over nations and people, invincible and inflexible . . . Surely a soldier's eye and a soldier's heart would choose by intuition this field of England for the warfare of faith. . . . It is the head of Protestantism, the centre of its movements, and the stronghold of its powers. Weakened in England, it is paralysed everywhere; conquered in England, it is conquered throughout the world. Once overthrown here all is but a war of detail. All the roads of the whole world meet in one point, and this point reached, the whole world lies open to the Church's will."

This speech he has not hesitated to publish in his *Sermons on Ecclesiastical Subjects*. (10)

Again, in the third volume of the same series (1873, p. 97) Dr. Manning represents the Pope as saying:—

"In His (Christ's) right I am sovereign. I acknowledge no civil superior, I am the subject of no Prince, and I claim more than this—I claim to be the supreme judge on earth, and director of the consciences of men; of the peasant that tills the field and the Prince that sits on the throne; of the household that sits in the shade of privacy, and the legislature that makes laws for kingdoms. I am the sole last supreme judge on earth of what is right and wrong."

Again, in *Essays on Religion and Literature*, edited by "Cardinal Manning," (11) we find it stated:—

"That neither the Church nor the State, whensoever they are united on the true basis of Divine right, have any cognisance of tolerance. . . . The Church [that is, of course, the Roman Church] has the right, in virtue of her divine commission, to require of every one to accept her doctrine. *Whosoever obstinately refuses or obstinately insists upon the election out of it of what is pleasing to himself* is against her. But were the Church to tolerate such an opponent, she must tolerate another. If she tolerate one sect, she must tolerate every sect, and thereby give herself up."

Again, in pp. 416-417 of the same work, we read (all which Dr. Manning endorses):—

"Moreover, the right of deposing kings is inherent in the supreme sovereignty which the Popes, as viceregents of Christ, exercise over all Christian nations." . . . "These are not derived or delegated rights, but are of the essence of that royal authority of Christ, with which his viceregents on earth are vested." "When, therefore, for the common good the Head of the Church exercises his supreme authority either by excommunicating individuals, by laying nations under an interdict, or by deposing kings, all Christian people are bound to obey his decree,"

Again, in his second series of the same *Essays* (1867, p. 19) he wrote:—

"The Royal Supremacy has perished, by the law of morality which consumes all earthly things. And, at this period of our history the Supremacy of the Vicar of Jesus Christ re-enters, as full of life as when Henry VIII. resisted Clement VI., and Elizabeth withstood Pius V. The undying authority of the

(10) vol. i., pp. 166, 167. London, 1870.

(11) Longmans, 1867, p. 403.

Holy See is once more an active power in England; the shadow of Peter has fallen again upon it."

As a Bishop of the Roman Church in England, Dr. Manning, took a further oath that he would "persecute and fight" all heretics (*persequar et impugnabo*). From the Queen to the lowest peasant, members of our Reformed Churches, all are, according to Dr. Manning, heretics. If he places any value on his own oath he must persecute in genuine Romish style, every heretic; but happily, as yet, at least, we are protected by our laws. Without travelling beyond the borders of our own land for examples of the fearful persecutions of so-called heretics, the short reign of Queen Mary affords sufficient proofs of the cruel and persecuting spirit of Popery, when Romish Bishops and Priests ruled. Indeed, Dr. Manning, in his work entitled *The Catholic Church and Modern Society*, (12) referring to the time when this country was subject to Priest Rule, says:—

"The civil and ecclesiastical discipline was so coincident and concurrent that a heretic was to be avoided by the citizens as by all Christians. He not only forfeited his civil rights, but was put beyond the pale and commerce of human society. He was like the leper of Israel, whom no man could touch without becoming legally unclean. No man could give to the heretic fire or water."

But why could not Dr. Manning tell the whole truth? So-called heretics were mercilessly massacred, and, worse than that, *burnt alive*!

We have seen above, according to Dr. Manning, that the Pontifical utterances contained in the Bulls *Unam Sanctum*, *Unigenitus*, *Auctorem fidei*, "and the like" are to be accepted as infallible utterances. And again, in his Letter addressed to the *Academia of the Catholic Religion*, (13) he declared that the Bull of Boniface VIII. (*Unan Sanctan*) and the *Syllabus* of the late Pope Pius IX. contain the doctrines "of Ultramontanism and Christianity." Dr. Manning is essentially an Ultramontanist in doctrine and practice.

Now let us examine briefly the contents of these infallible documents.

And first the *Syllabus* of Pope Pius IX. In this he condemned and anathematised:—

"Those who maintain the *Liberty of the Press*." Or "the liberty of conscience and of worship." Or "the liberty of Speech."

"Or who contend that Papal judgements and decrees may, without sin, be disobeyed, or differed from, unless they treat of the rules (*dogmata*) of faith or morals.

"Or who assign to the State the power of defining the *civil rights (jura)* and province of the Church.

"Or who hold that Roman Pontiffs and Œcumenical Councils have transgressed the limits of their power, and usurped the rights of Princes.

(12) London: 1880, p. 12.

(13) *Times*, 24th Dec., 1873.

“Or who hold that the Church may not employ force.

“Or that power, not inherent in the office of the Episcopate, but granted to it by the *civil authority*, may be withdrawn from it at the discretion of that authority.

“Or that the *civil immunity* of the Church and its ministers depends upon *civil right*.

“Or that knowledge of things *philosophical and civil* may and should decline to be guided by *Divine and Ecclesiastical* authority.

“Or that marriage, not sacramentally contracted, has a binding force.

“Or that any other religion than the Roman Religion may be established by a State.

“Or that in ‘Countries called Catholic’ the *free exercise of other religions* may be *laudably allowed*.

“Or that the Roman Pontiff ought to come to terms with progress, liberalism, and modern civilization.”

All this is confirmed by the present Pope, Leo XIII., as witnessed by the Romish paper, the *Tablet*, 14th Nov., 1885, and the present Pope denounced the Reformation as “the origin of the recent principles of *unbridled liberty* ;” he repudiates the idea of “equality,” or that “each man should be allowed *freely to think* on whatever subject he pleases,” and he condemns any Government in which “*every one will be allowed to follow the religion he prefers*.” Dr. Manning, in a circular addressed to the Roman Priesthood in England, directed them to carry out to the letter, the principles enunciated in this “Syllabus.”

I take next the third Canon of the fourth Lateran Council, held under Innocent III., called a General Council. And here I may mention that desperate efforts have been made by some members of the Roman Church, who are ashamed of this murderous enactment, to shift the responsibility of this decree from a General Council on to the Pope personally. But that plea has been completely refuted by the Rev. John Evans in his learned work :—*The Statutes of the Fourth General Council of Lateran, recognised and established by subsequent Councils and Synods down to the Council of Trent*. (14) But whether the Decree be of the Council or of the Pope, read at that Council, Dr. Manning equally accepts it as an infallible utterance, and binding on his conscience, and he is bound to act up to it *if he can*. It is the acme of Papal assumption, and has never been set aside by any competent authority in the Roman Church. It is too long to set out in full. The following extracts are sufficient to show its nature :—

“We excommunicate and anathematize every heresy which exalteth itself against this holy, orthodox, and Catholic faith, which we have set forth above, [N.B. Transubstantiation was, by the first Canon of this Council for the first time defined and promulgated as a doctrine of the Roman Church, for the

denial of which so many were burned alive under Mary] condemning *all heresies*, by whatsoever names they may be reckoned; who have, indeed, divers faces, but their tails are bound together, for they make agreement in the same folly. Let such persons when condemned, be left to the secular powers who may be present, or to their officers, to be punished in a fitting manner; those who are of the clergy being first degraded from their orders; so that the goods of such condemned persons, if they shall be laymen, be confiscated, but in case of clerks be applied to the churches from which they derive their stipend. . . . And let the secular powers, whatever offices they may discharge, be admonished, and induced, and, if need be, *compelled by ecclesiastical censure*, that as they desire to be reputed and accounted faithful, so, for the defence of the faith, they publicly set forth an oath that to the utmost of their power they will sincerely strive to exterminate from the land subject to their jurisdiction all heretics pointed out by the Church; so that whensoever any person is advanced *either to spiritual or temporal power, he be bound to confirm this decree with an oath.*" (15)

The Decree then proceeds to declare that if any temporal Lord, when required to put the decree in force against heretics, refuses, he is to be deposed, and his subjects released from their allegiance to him. That all such excommunicated persons are incapable of giving evidence as witnesses, or to hold any property. If a judge, his judgments have no force; if an advocate, his pleading is invalid; if a notary (solicitor), his legal documents are void, and "be condemned with their damned author (*cum autore damnato damnatur*)."

And every Bishop and Archbishop, either by himself or by his Archdeacon, twice, or at least once a year, is ordered to go round his diocese, to search out heretics and compel them to "clear themselves of the crime alleged against them; and if any of them, with damnable obstinacy, rejecting *the obligation of an oath*, shall perhaps be unwilling to swear, let them on that very account be reckoned as heretics." And Bishops are ordered, if they "desire to escape canonical vengeance," to carry out this decree to the letter. The Council which passed this persecuting decree has been formally recognised as of authority in England in the popular books of Devotion: *The Garden of the Soul* (Stereotype Edition, London, p. iv. Keating and Brown, 1835.) *The Key to Heaven* (fifteenth edition, p. vi. Keating and Brown, 1823); and *A Manual of Devout Prayers* (p. iv.) "With permission," Keating and Brown, 1817.

I desire to draw particular attention to this last injunction as to compulsory oaths, and ask that it may be borne in mind when we come to consider the alleged persecuting Statutes of Elizabeth and James I.

With reference to the Bull *Unam Sanctam*, which Dr Manning so unequivocally endorses, the following extract will be sufficient for our purpose:—

"Here (Luke xxii. 38) the Almighty, speaks of the right of the Church to

judge the temporal power, and if the temporal power swerves from its duty that it shall be condemned by the spiritual; and, since Peter said to Christ, 'Lord, here are two swords;' therefore, the Pope has both the temporal and spiritual swords at his command. . . . It is necessary that one sword should be under another, and *that the temporal authority should be subject to the spiritual power.* And thus the prophecy of Jeremiah is fulfilled in the Church, and the Ecclesiastical power, 'Behold, I have set thee over the Kingdoms, *to root out, and to pull down, and to destroy, and to throw down, to build, and to plant!*' Therefore, if the earthly power go astray, it must be judged by the spiritual power; but if the spiritual power go astray, it must be judged by God alone. Moreover, we declare, say, define, and pronounce it to be altogether necessary to salvation *that every human creature should be subject to the Roman Pontiff.*" (16)

This Bull, according to Bossuet, was withdrawn by Pope Clement V.; but this Dr. Manning denies, and asserts that Clement "only interprets the Bull in its true sense." This "true sense" which Dr. Manning labours to expound, is very different from that conceived by the Pope's own words, which can only bear one obvious meaning—the exaltation of the Papacy above all civil powers. What authority has Dr. Manning to exercise his *private judgment* on the *ex-Cathedrâ* declaration of an Infallable Pope, and to give it an interpretation different from its simple grammatical construction? A Right Rev. Prelate of the Roman Church, who was born and bred and died in that communion, compared to whom Dr. Manning is but a mushroom priest—Dr. James Doyle—took a very practical view of the inordinate ambition of Popes; he said in his *Address to the Right Hon. the Earl of Liverpool* (Dublin, 1826):—

"The proceedings of this Pontiff, however, deserve special attention [he referred to the domineering acts of Gregory VII., the ecclesiastical bully Hildebrand], as it is he who commenced the warfare of the Popes against the independence of Princes and States. As to the arguments from Scripture or tradition adduced by him, or by any of his successors in support of their temporal claims, they are such as will amuse, or rather excite the pity, of a serious mind. *One wisely observes that because an Apostle said to our Lord, 'Behold there are two swords here,' the Popes have a right to depose kings.* Such an inference might appear plausible to him who was already resolved on a usurpation of right; but a Christian is forced to blush at such a profanation of the Word of God. . . . If I were living then, and had been consulted, I should read as my only reply a chapter from St. Paul to Timothy, in which he recommends, above all, prayers to be offered up for those who are in high station, whether they were acquainted with Clement, or even with Christ Himself or not, that all might be enabled to lead quiet and holy lives; or I should have submitted to him who consulted me the declaration of our Lord before Pilate, who, instead of asking His Father for legions of angels to depose him who was about to condemn to death the Author of life, declared that the power of this judge, though grossly abused, was given Him from above, and that though He, Himself, was a King, His Kingdom was not of this world. Such reflections, it is

true, might have little, or no weight, with men blindfolded by habitual prejudices, and urged on, *as some men still are*, in their course of ruin by pride, interest, or ambition; but I should at least have washed my hands amongst the innocent, and been clean of the blood which flowed in torrents, in consequence of the decisions which they were about to pronounce."

Dr. Doyle might have further added the rebuke addressed by our Lord to Peter—"Put up again thy sword into its place" "For all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword" (Matt. xxvi. 52.) If by "the sword" the temporal power of the Pope was signified, then our Lord's words have come true, for the temporal power of the Pope has "perished."

I commend these "reflections" to the serious consideration of Dr. Manning.

I must not pass over the Bull *In Cœnæ Domini*, issued by Pius V., one of Dr. Manning's real canonised saints (quoted as of authority in Dens' *Theologia Moralis*.) (17) The following is an extract:—

"In the name of the Holy Trinity; of the Blessed Mother of God, the Virgin Mary, of St. Peter, of St. Paul, in the name of the holy host of Heaven, of the Archangels and Angels; of the holy Apostles and blessed Martyrs, we do anathematise all heretics, lying, trading, or travelling in or amongst the same, *wheresoever dispersed over the face* of the whole earth. We further will and authorise the wise and learned of our ecclesiastics, expert in divine science, to labour, endeavour, and devise all manner of devices to be devised, to abate, assuage and confound these heresies, repugnant to our sacred laws, that thereby these heretics may be either recalled to confess their errors and acknowledge our jurisdiction of the See of Rome, or that a total infamy may be brought upon them and their posterities by a perpetual discord and contention among themselves, by which means they may either speedily perish by God's wrath, or continue in eternal difference, to the reproach of Jew, Turk, Heathen—nay, of the Devils themselves."

We can afford to smile at such Papal wind-bags, but with Dr. Manning they are stern realities!

Not to weary the reader by quoting in detail the several exterminating Bulls of Popes, all equally binding on the conscience of Dr. Manning, under his expression, "and the like," as *ex-Cathedrâ* utterances, I need simply refer to the Bulls of Honorius III., confirming the laws issued by the Emperor Frederick II. for the extermination of heretics; of Innocent IV. to the same effect, who also issued a Bull for a crusade against heretics. Pope Alexander IV., who appointed Inquisitors, and Urban IV. instructed them to exterminate heretics. Pope Clement IV. confirmed the constitutions of Pope Innocent IV. against heretics. Nicholas III. issued a Bull for their excommunication, and Pope John XXII for their ex-

termination. Boniface IX. also confirmed the exterminating laws of Frederick II.

Pope Innocent VIII. decreed the punishment, and Julius II. the anathematising of heretics. Pope Leo X. condemned, among other (so-called) errors of Luther, his assertion that "the burning of heretics was contrary to the will of the Holy Spirit." Paul III. issued the famous, or rather infamous, Bull *In Cœnæ Domini*. Pope Julius III. issued his Bull against all those who should oppose the Inquisitors, and Paul IV. called into exercise *all* the persecuting Decrees, Acts of Councils, and Bulls that had ever been enacted or issued; and Gregory IX. inserted in the Canon Law of the Church of Rome, or Decretals, the above decree of Innocent III. passed at the Fourth Lateral Council; the same Canon Law Dr. Manning has urged as a study in all colleges. We now can appreciate the value of the oath taken by Dr. Manning on his assuming, at the hands of the Pope, the Office of a Roman Bishop in England. It is fair to presume that it is only the controlling power of our laws which precludes him from enforcing the literal accomplishment of his Episcopal oath. Dr. Manning cannot escape the responsibility of maintaining, where he has the power, the system of the persecuting principles of his Church. He is bound hand and foot to the Romish Juggernaut.

It is in vain to be told that these Papal thunderbolts have now passed into space. Rome claims as her motto, *Semper eadem*. While all our so-called Penal Laws stand repealed, Rome's persecuting Bulls still remain unrepealed. They are claimed to be the *infallible* utterances of *infallible* Popes. And after a careful perusal of Dr. Manning's several works, and they are numerous, I have not met with a single expression to enable us to come to any other conclusion than that he accepts them as such, and in every way of the same subsisting authority and infallible utterances as those to which he has given his unqualified approval. But—

"Fœdius hoc aliquid quandoque audebis."—*Juvenal Sat.*

If Dr. Manning is not able to put in practice these persecuting Bulls, nevertheless, with untiring energy he has furthered in various ways his revolutionary and unpatriotic sentiments. One powerful weapon has been to give his sanction to, and recommendation of Controversial works, published with the express object of perversion. There is, however, happily no law in this country to prevent any one preaching and teaching his religious views, and endeavouring in a peaceable manner to make converts to their views; but that is a very different process from giving sanction to actions or works inculcating

persecuting, revolutionary or disloyal sentiments; and this Dr. Manning has done by giving his "Imprimatur" as "Henricus Edwardus Card. Archiepus. Westmin.," to a book entitled "A Calendar of English Martyrs of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries." (18) These "martyrs" are alleged to have "suffered death for the Catholic faith," who were called upon "to shed their blood for Christ's Sake." In publishing this list:—

"It was thought that such a roll of our martyrs, marking day by day the recurring anniversaries of their victories, would help to keep alive their memory in the minds of English Catholics, and, moreover, suggest the practical devotion of habitually invoking their intercession."

But I must remind Dr. Manning that Pope Alexander III. decreed that no one should be acknowledged as a saint and invoked, unless he had been declared to be a saint (in other words canonised) by the Bishop of Rome; and the reason given was, lest idolatry be committed by invoking one not in a state of happiness. (19) I am not aware that any of these so-called martyrs have been canonised, though it is now the subject of the serious consideration of the "Sacred Congregation of Rites" (see *Tablet*, 11 Dec., 1886.)

In this list, the dates of whose martyrdom are given in the "Calendar," we find thirty-four who are said to have suffered in the time of Henry VIII. How it can be maintained that these thirty-four unfortunates suffered for the "Catholic faith," or that they "shed their blood for Christ's sake," is difficult to comprehend. It must be specially noted that the Pope Supremacy was *not* a doctrine or article of faith in the Roman Church until the passing of the Vatican decree of 1870, when Pope Pius' Creed was amended as above set forth. As a historical fact beyond contradiction, the entire bench of Bishops—except Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, and all the civil officers of the Crown, save Sir Thomas More, voluntarily renounced their allegiance to the Pope of Rome, and took the oath of supremacy to the King, but maintained every single Romish doctrine of faith. Fisher and More are recorded in this Calendar as having "suffered death for the Catholic faith," and "shed their blood for Christ's sake," and are therefore recommended by Dr. Manning to be invoked for their intercession and imitation. It is true that their canonisation is mooted, but Dr. Manning is anticipating the decree of the Pope. They both suffered as *traitors*, and were *beheaded* under laws passed by Romanists themselves.

That Henry VIII. and the entire nation were essentially Roman

(18) London, 1876.

(19) Polydore Virgil. *In rer. Invent.*, Book vi., c. vii., fol. cxxii. London, 1531.

Catholic in doctrine is incontestably proved by the passing of the Persecuting Act of Parliament (31 Henry VIII., c. 14), six years after the Bull of excommunication of Henry had been published, commonly called the "The Six Articles Act," Under this Act all persons who denied the Romish doctrine of Transubstantiation *were condemned to be burnt*; those who denied communion in one kind, the perpetual vows of chastity, private masses, the celibacy of the clergy, and auricular confession, were to be accounted felons, and on conviction to be put to death, and their goods forfeited. These are essentially Popish doctrines; and not one case is cited in this "Calendar" of a so-called martyr who suffered otherwise than for high treason against the Crown of England under Acts of Parliament passed by Roman Catholics themselves; though we do find that many were condemned for not submitting to the "Six Articles Act," but the names of these true martyrs, "who shed their blood for Christ's sake," are not recorded in this "Calendar."

In this list we have not one case recorded of any so-called martyr, under our Protestant King Edward VI!

During the short reign of Mary we have, indeed, a long list of real martyrs for the true Catholic faith, of men, women, and children, who were put to excruciating tortures, and committed to the flames at Smithfield and elsewhere, for refusing to admit what Dr. Manning would call "the Catholic faith" as defined by the "Six Articles Act," but not one of these true martyrs for the faith finds a place in this "Calendar." They were, with few exceptions, committed to the flames for denying that theological enigma Transubstantiation, by which the Roman Priest professes to create his God from a piece of bread, then worships it as a God, and then eats *it* or *him*.

"The workman made it, therefore it is not God."—Hosea viii., 6.

As might be expected, however, we have a long list of "Martyrs" for the "Catholic faith" who suffered under Elizabeth. Every single instance recorded in this Calendar is "hanging," the penalty of death of a *traitor*. Not one single case in this list can be shown of hanging for holding any Romish doctrine, or otherwise than for treason. Of this we have ample testimony, even that of some Secular Priests themselves, who, in the latter part of the reign of Elizabeth, were imprisoned on suspicion of treason. We have a work written by the Priest, Watson, in the name of himself and other priests, published in 1601, entitled "Important Considerations: to move all true Catholics, who are not wholly Jesuitised, to acknowledge without equivocation, ambiguities or sufferings, that the proceedings of Her Majesty and of the State with them, since the beginning of Her

Highness's reign, have been most mild and merciful." In this book it is repeatedly asserted, as a fact, that not one of those who suffered under this reign, so suffered on account of his religion, but for traitorous conduct, and they fearlessly denounce the several acts of treason, secretly and openly preached, and their participation in rebellions against the Crown. This evidence is corroborated by the Romish Annalist, Bzovius, who was constrained to admit that there was not any that suffered in Queen Elizabeth's reign, except those who taught the dangerous doctrine that the Pope could depose kings. (20)

As an important fact let it be remembered that when Elizabeth came to the throne there were upwards of 9,400 Ecclesiastics of various grades holding preferments; of these the whole, except about 200, readily, voluntarily, and without compulsion took the oath of allegiance to the Queen, and retained their livings and adopted the English Liturgy (21) And of the Irish Bishops, all but two, accompanied by the entire body of the clergy, followed this example; they abandoned the authority of the Pope and adopted the English Liturgy and the Reformed Religion. (22)

The reader will bear in mind that we are on the subject of Dr. Manning's approval of the "Calendar" of the so-called martyrs—who suffered, in fact, as traitors against their Queen and country—principally English Jesuit Priests, sent to this country under the directions and patronage of the Pope.

For twelve years Her Majesty's subjects lived in peace and harmony until Pope Pius V., on the 5th March, 1570, issued his Bull of "deposition, excommunication, and damnation" of Queen Elizabeth, absolving her subjects from their oath of allegiance. After which, and at the Pope's instigation, treason and rebellions were fostered. Two colleges abroad were established for the express object of training Englishmen as priests to visit this country to withdraw the Queen's subjects from their allegiance. They mostly went under disguise, and were the primary cause of all the suffering that followed.

With reference to the Bull of excommunication, Berington, a Roman priest, in his "Introduction" to the *Memoire of Gregoria Panzini* (23) states that:—

"After the promulgation of the Bull six queries were generally proposed to the

(20) *De Rom. Pont.*, c. xlv. p. 621, Edit. Antwerp, 1601.

(21) See Camden's *Annals of the Reign of Elizabeth*, p. 17, 3rd. Edit., London, 1848.

(22) see Murray's *Ecc. Hist. of Ireland* 2nd edit., c. xii., p. 203, London, 1635.

(23) p. 34, Birmingham, 1793.

priests who were arraigned. They regarded the import of that Bull—the deposition of the Queen, as pronounced in it, and what should be the conduct of good subjects in reference to both. Few answered, *I am sorry to observe, as became loyal Englishmen and faithful citizens.* They seemed rather to consider themselves as the subjects of a foreign master whose sovereignty was paramount, and whose will was supreme.”

And yet Dr. Manning would have us believe that they shed their blood for Christ's sake! In what does Dr. Manning's loyalty as an Englishman consist? With very few exceptions those who suffered as alleged martyrs, enumerated in this “Calendar,” were English seminary priests educated abroad, and who came to this country for the express object of hatching treason and rebellions against the Queen. Of these the same priest, Berington, says as follows:— (24)

“This secession I lament, because, had these men remained at home, patient of present evils, and submissive, as far as might be, to the laws, had they continued the practice of their religion in retirement, and distributed, without clamour, instruction to those that claimed it, the rigour of the legislature would soon have relaxed, no jealousy would have been excited, *and no penal statutes we may now pronounce, would have entailed misfortune upon them and their successors.*”

Speaking of these seminaries abroad, from which these so-called missionaries had emigrated to this country, the Rev. W. Berington adds:—

“It will not be denied that from the operation of various causes, our foreign houses soon imbibed an ultramontane spirit, which, as it flattered,—and by flattering secured the favour of Rome, so did it offend—and by offending, draw down upon our heads the vengeance of the British Government. *The doctrine of deposing princes, and disposing of their crowns,* with other concomitant maxims of a like tendency, were the *pabulum* on which that ultramontane spirit fed; and we may now easily discover, in reading their works, that the divines of our English seminaries had, with a culpable inattention to circumstances, *espoused these dangerous tenets.* Their direct application to the Princess on the throne, and to many events of her reign, proved too evidently that they were not tenets of barren speculation, calculated for the exercise of school disputation only; and if they rendered the men who maintained them obnoxious to the State, exposing them to prosecution and imprisonment, and sometimes even to death, it should not excite our wonder.”

Dr. Manning by giving his “*Imprimatur*” to the assertion that these men were martyrs for “the Catholic faith,” himself endorses the “dangerous tenets” of these would-be “canonized” martyrs; and by virtue of his Priestly and Episcopal oaths, he would put them in practice—if he dared!

Which was the more honest, loyal priest, Berington or Manning?

Before I proceed to examine this list of “Elizabethan martyrs,” I

shall record a few facts and dates which will expose the utter inconsistency of these Papal agitators, who called in question Elizabeth's legitimacy and her right of succession, the war-cry of those Papal fanatics :—

1. Pope Julius II. granted to Henry a dispensation to marry Catherine, his brother's widow, an alliance prohibited by the Roman Canon Law, and alleged to be contrary to Scripture. If there had been no legal or moral impediment, the dispensation would not have been required. (A.D. 1509.)

2. In December, 1527, according to the Roman Catholic Historian, Dr. Lingard, the Pope, *in writing*, "granted a dispensation to marry, in the place of Catherine, *any other woman whomsoever, even if she were already promised to another or related to him in the first degree of affinity.*" (25) Surely this was essentially a question of *morals* on which the Pope is claimed to be infallible.

3. Henry married Anne Boleyn, January 1533 (some say the November previous), with the sanction of the Pope, as above.

4. Elizabeth was born 7th Sept., 1533.

5. On this day the Pope, through the King of France, offered to sanction this marriage and declare Elizabeth legitimate if Henry would submit to the Pope's jurisdiction. Henry refused.

6. Paul III. in 1538, issued his Bull of deposition and excommunication against Henry.

7. Elizabeth came to the throne in November, 1558, when as already stated, the entire body of the Roman clergy and people, with few exceptions, embraced the Reformed Religion and acknowledged the Queen's supremacy.

8. In May, 1560, the Pope offered in writing to recognise the Queen's title, the Reformation and the Revised Prayer-Book, if she accepted his authority and supremacy. The Pope even addressed her as his "dear daughter in Christ." Elizabeth refused to submit to the Pope's jurisdiction, and she was backed by the whole nation. (26)

10. The Pope published his Bull of excommunication, deposition, and damnation of Elizabeth, 5 March, 1570.

From that day until the death of Elizabeth, the Pope and his emissaries were unceasing in their secret and open endeavours to plot

(25) *Hist. of England*, vol. vi., pp. 172-3. London, 1823.

(26) The documentary evidence in proof of Nos. 5, 7, 8, 9 are given in full in my reply to Cobbett's *History of the Reformation*.

the murder of the Queen, to subvert her Government and re-establish the authority of the Pope over this realm of England. Hence the necessity of the so-called Penal Laws, and as a result, the martyr roll now presented to us with the *imprimatur* of Dr. Manning.

On the 13 May, 1580, Gregory XIII. renewed the Bull of excommunication against Elizabeth in the same terms as the previous Bull of Pius V. "granting the same Plenary Indulgence *and remission of all sins*, which those obtained who warred against the Turks and for the recovery of the Holy Land." (27) Be it remembered that it is Dr. Manning himself who refers us back to those days, as examples of the orthodox principles of "the Catholic Faith." It was the issue of those Bulls which created the martyrs!

In considering the alleged Penal Laws under which so many English priests, traitors to their Queen and country, perished, are we to pass a wet sponge over all the antecedent persecuting Papal Bulls commanding the extermination of heretics? Are we called upon to recollect nothing of the cruel achievements of the Papal Moloch in the South of France, and in the valleys of North Italy; the hecatombs of legalised slaughter by the so-called "Holy" Inquisition, the Gallican Massacres on St. Bartholomew's Day, the slaughter in cold blood of hundreds of thousands in Germany and the Netherlands as holocausts, to appease the *Alter Dues* of Rome? the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and the dragonades that followed, the fires of Smithfield under Mary, "the most holy Mary," *sanctissima femina Maria*, according to the traitor Sanders? Are we, I say, called upon to forget all these persecutions and concentrate our sympathy for a comparative handful of Popish rebel priests who were hanged for treason against their Queen and country? Are we to account them saints who "shed their blood for Christ's sake," and, at the beck and call of Dr. Manning, to "mark day by day the recurring anniversaries" of their executions, "to keep alive in the memory of English Catholics" the traitorous acts for which they suffered? It is in this character that Dr. Manning would present to us this martyr roll of convicted traitors.

The first three alleged martyrs who suffered under Elizabeth, given in this "Calendar," approved by Dr. Manning, are *Maine* (1577, p. 36), *Nelson*, (1578, p. 18), and *Sherwood* (1578, p. 16). That is *nineteen* years after the accession of Elizabeth to the throne, and *seven* years after the publication of the Pope's Bull of her excommunication and deposition. These are important dates. The three so-called martyrs were seminary priests, sent by the Pope from abroad; "they

(27) See Wilkin's *Concil. Brit.*, vol. iv., p. 296. London, 1737.

taught that the Queen was a schismatic and a heretic, and therefore to be deposed ; for this they suffered death." (28)

The very first "martyr" recorded on this list, after the publication of the Bull of Gregory XIII., on May, 1580, is the notorious Jesuit rebel, *Campion* (1581, p. 371). that is, twelve years after the publication of the original Bull. In the meantime the conspiracies of Savage, Ballard, Babington, Morgan, Ridolfi (the special emissary of the Pope), and others had been discovered, the rebellions of the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland and others had been frustrated, and conspiracies to murder the Queen detected. The Rev. Joseph Mendham, in his "Life of Saint Pius V.," (29) gives the text of the letter of Pius V., addressed to these noblemen urging them on to rebellion: "to deliver yourselves and that Kingdom from the basest of women's lust, and to recover them to the primitive obedience of this Holy See."

Hume describes the danger in which Elizabeth continually lived:—

"The assassination of heretical sovereigns, and of that Princess [Elizabeth] in particular, was represented as the most meritorious of all enterprises, and that they thought that whoever perished in such pious attempts, enjoyed, without dispute, the glorious and never-fading crown of martyrdom. (30)

"Campion (on his arrest) being asked first whether Queen Elizabeth was a lawful Queen, refused to answer ; then whether he would take part with the Queen or the Pope, if the latter should send forces against the Queen, he openly professed and testified under his hand that he would stand for the Pope. Afterwards some others were examined for the same causes, whereas, in full ten years after the rebellion, there had been no more than five Papists put to death." (31)

And this is one of Dr. Manning's conspicuous martyrs for the "cause of Christ" for the "Catholic faith"! With Dr. Manning, therefore, treason, and rebellion are parts of "Catholic faith"—*Habemus confitentium reum.*

I do not find in this list the name of Parry, who on his own confession, held the dispensation of the Pope "with Plenary Indulgence and remission of all his sins"; with promises of reward, if he should succeed in murdering the Queen. (32) Parry expressed contrition for the bloody act he was bribed to perpetrate, he thereby, probably in the estimation of Dr. Manning and the compiler of this "Calendar," forfeited his right to be ranked among the martyrs of his church.

In the "Introduction" (p. 5) we are referred to *William Allen* as

(28) See Camden's *Annals of Elizabeth*, p. 261, London 1635.

(29) 1832, p. 130.

(30) *History of England*, c. xli., vol. iv., p. 33, London, 1851.

(31) See Camden's *History of the Reign of Elizabeth*, p. 240, 3rd edit., 1635.

(32) See Cobbett's *State Trials*, An. 1584, Nc. 60, vol. 1, col. 1105.

“first seminary priest, the fruitful parent of many others, and the nursery of future martyrs.” This traitor was made “Cardinal of England” in 1588, in defiance of the law of this country, and in April of that year he addressed “the nobility and people of England and Ireland,” an “Admonition,” keeping himself, however, out of harm’s way. In this “Admonition” he refers with pride to the two Bulls of excommunication against “the tyrant Elizabeth and her usurped State and Dominion.” He further asserts that Elizabeth “was lawfully excommunicated,” and that she should be expelled from her throne on which “she had unlawfully intruded herself,” at the same time heaping on her most opprobrious and vituperative epithets, calling in question her legitimacy and chastity, exhorting all English “Catholics” to take part with the Spaniards in the then contemplated invasion, assuring them of their ultimate salvation and blessing of Christ and His Church, and the “ample pardon of their sins” should they die in taking arms against “the most unjust usurper and open injurer of all nations; an infamous, depraved, accursed, excommunicate heretic, the very shame of her sex and princely name.” (33)

And this, again, is the arch-traitor who is lauded and proposed for an example to be followed, and to which Dr. Manning has given his sanction!

Passing on to James I., the very first “martyr” recorded in p. 23 is the JESUIT GARNET, who conspired with others in the attempt to sacrifice, in cold blood, the lives of His Majesty’s loyal subjects when assembled in Parliament. And this is another of Dr. Manning’s martyrs and saints! Would he dare to assert before an English audience that Garnet suffered for the Catholic faith—that he shed his blood for Christ’s sake?

In consequence of the discovery of this infamous plot King James, under the authority of an Act of Parliament (3 James I., c. 4), required all priests to take the oath of allegiance to the Crown. The Proclamation, dated July 4, 1605, extended only to seminary priests and Jesuits obtaining their orders from abroad. (34) Dr. Reid, in his *History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland* (35) observes:—

“Of these measures against Popery, however, James appears to have been actuated more by his dread of their tenets relative to the temporal power of the Pope than by a conscientious abhorrence of their doctrinal errors. The private exercise of their worship was therefore connived at, and would have been soon openly tolerated had not the discovery of the Gunpowder Plot in England, and

(33) An exact reprint of this document was published by the Rev. J. Mendham in 1842.

(34) See State Paper Office, *Ireland Domestic*, (1605), vol. xxvii., p. 49.

(35) vol., i., pp. 73, *et seq.* Edinburgh, 1834.

the detection of some Romish emissaries in Ireland about the same period, roused the King's apprehensions of foreign interference, and determined him to refuse all countenance to a religion so hostile to the rights of princes."

Several priests refused to take the prescribed oath of allegiance unless so authorised by the Pope. It will not be overlooked that the decree of Innocent III., passed at the Lateran Council, directed all bishops to tender a form of oath to be taken by all suspected heretics, and who did not believe in (among other Popish dogmas) the monstrous dogma of Transubstantiation, then recently enacted, and yet this tendering of an oath to test the loyalty to the constitution of the realm, is denounced as persecuting! The Roman Catholic priest, Dr. O'Connor, in his "Historical Narrative of Eleven Priests confined in Newgate for not renouncing the Pope's Pretended Power" (36) tells us that:—

"There is yet extant a Petition to Pope Paul V. signed by eleven priests, who were under sentence of death in Newgate, for refusing James' oath of allegiance, in 1612. Two of their companions had already suffered death for this offence. *They died in resistance to legitimate authority, and by the instigation of a foreign power.* In this petition they entreat of His Holiness, *by all that is sacred*, to attend to their horrible situation, and they beg of him to point out to them *clearly* in what that oath, for which they were condemned to die, is repugnant to Catholic faith. But yet inflamed by the courtly maxims they declare their belief in his ultimate power, and they conclude with a solemn protest of blind submission to all his decrees, with an obedience as implicit as if Rome were another Mecca, or as if the Vatican were the seraglio of a Mahomet."

Dr. O'Connor condemns, in indignant terms, the refusal of the Pope to comply with this Petition:—

"In consequence of this horrible decision the following innocent English clergymen—Alas! how many Irish—suffered as victims to the domination of Vicars Apostolic, and the fatal influence of the Court of Rome."

He then enumerates by name, and dates of execution of these eleven Priests, who, he tells us, were offered their liberty if they took the oath of allegiance, but who "in blind obedience to Rome" were hanged; and he unhesitatingly lays the charge of murder on the Pope. These eleven priests—martyrs to Popish tyranny—are actually recorded in the "Calendar as English Martyrs" under the respective dates as given by Dr. O'Connor, all of whom, according to Dr. Manning, suffered for "the Catholic Faith!" Now listen to the words of encouragement endorsed by Dr. Manning addressed to English Romanists in this book:—

"Although in these more peaceful times we may not be called upon to shed our blood for Christ's sake, yet the spirit of martyrdom should never be wanting

in us; and the example of the heroic lives, and still more heroic deaths, of these our suffering forefathers in the faith should be continually urging us to a like contempt of this life and this world's goods if set against God's honour."

What is this but a public exhortation to Roman Catholics, that, should the occasion arise, they are to enrol themselves under the banner of the Pope against their Sovereign and country? Papists first, Englishmen after, and that martyrdom in such a cause would be to God's honour.

Need I give further evidence than what has been here related, that Dr. Manning, as an Englishman, is an advocate and apologist for rebels and traitors; and, by a fair inference, that he would, as such, be prepared to range himself under the banner of the Pope should occasion require it?

Every Penal Act affecting Roman Catholics, and all classes of Dissenters in England have been repealed, while every Papal persecuting enactment still remains in force.

And this is the same Dr. Manning who has the boldness to assert before an audience of Englishmen that "*as a member of their great Commonwealth, he claimed to be wholly and altogether a loyal subject of our gracious Sovereign, and one most obedient to the law of the land.*"

"Vera redit facies, dissimulata perit."
(*"The real face appears, the false one is gone."*)

PRICE TWOPENCE.

THE VALIDITY OF PRIESTS' ORDERS

OF

DR. BAGSHAWE,

Bishop of Roman Catholics in Nottingham;

AND OF

THE REV. JOHN PROVOST HARNETT,

A Roman Priest in Nottingham,

C H A L L E N G E D

BY

CHARLES HASTINGS COLLETTE.

“They have committed two evils; they have forsaken
ME the fountain of living waters, and hewed them out
cisterns, broken cisterns that can hold no water.”

JEREMIAH ii. 13.

PUBLISHED BY

JAMES BELL, NOTTINGHAM,

AND

KENSIT, 18, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON.

1887.

